





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE

12mo. NET, \$1.00

BOLSHEVISM AND SOCIAL REVOLT

BY
DANIEL DORCHESTER, JR.



THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1919, by
DANIEL DORCHESTER, JR.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PRE-BOLSHEVISM.....	7
II. BOLSHEVISM AND KINDRED.....	23
III. RUSSIA'S PROBLEM THE WORLD PROBLEM	49
IV. ECONOMIC FORCE AND THE SOCIAL ORDER	76
V. PROPERTY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER.....	106
INDEX.....	123

CHAPTER I

PRE-BOLSHEVISM

THE ORIGIN OF ANARCHY

SOCIAL revolt is as old as society. According to the Bible, there was war in heaven; Satan and his angels rose in rebellion against the celestial government. Similar stories are found in other religions and traditions. Examples of daring revolt against power and authority have always had a strong fascination for certain minds and been a stimulus to like deeds. Bakounine, the great Russian anarchist and Nihilist, admired Satan as "the eternal rebel," "the first freethinker and emancipator of the worlds," "the unconquerable enemy of absolutism," whom "the proletariat should worship as his patron saint." There has been a rebellious spirit in man from the beginning. The passion to be free, to live one's own life and in one's own way; the

lust for power and pelf and the determination to gratify it in defiance of all restraint, have persisted in all ages and conditions.

Human government is inevitably defective and has always been mixed with more or less injustice. Whole races and classes have at times been cruelly kept in subjection. Hegel, in his *Philosophy of History*, after declaring that the goal of humanity is "the realization of freedom," states that among the Orientals "only One is free and the freedom of that One is caprice," which was often expressed by "brutal recklessness of passion." Among the Romans "some were free, but not man as such." Even the freedom-loving Greeks had slaves, "and their whole life and the maintenance of their splendid liberty was implicated with the institution of slavery."

THE MACHIAVELLIAN CONCEPTION OF THE STATE AND ANARCHY

For the last two centuries the Machiavelian conception of the state has dominated the most of Europe. This theory was based upon the generally accepted idea that there

must be some power superior to all other powers which can command the obedience of all and thus become a protection against the enemies of order within and without. This power is lodged in "the Prince," that is, in some person of royal blood. Out of this despotic idea grew monarchies of irresponsible power, with unlimited sovereignty and arbitrary decrees, which have trampled upon human rights and strangled the life of peoples.

Thackeray, in his *Four Georges*, gives a single example of how peoples and their property were subject to the will of the ruler to be disposed of as he saw fit. "The Duke of Hanover sold to the seniory of Venice six thousand seven hundred of his subjects, of whom only one thousand four hundred ever saw their homes again, the proceeds of the sale being devoted to the satisfaction of the royal duke's sensual pleasures. 'Round all that royal splendor lies a nation enslaved and ruined; there are people robbed of their rights—communities laid waste—faith, justice, commerce trampled upon and well-nigh destroyed—nay, in the

very center of royalty itself, what horrible stains of meanness, crime, and shame! . . . *This is going on all Europe over.*"¹

The countries of Europe were ruled and exploited by a despotic few who claimed to be chosen by God and under no obligation to make concessions to their subjects because it was just to do so, but only as an act of grace. Not until the nineteenth century was the odious practice of treating the people of a territory as chattels wholly discontinued. Down to this great war, notably in Germany, Austria, and Russia, the rulers persisted in the exercise of irresponsible

¹ "The experience of three centuries has demonstrated that, far from insuring respect for the rights of all, the principle of the balance of power resulted merely in causing the powerful states to concede that every acquisition of territory made by one of them might justify equivalent acquisitions on the part of the rest. . . . Powerful to introduce peace and justice into international relations, it has veiled with specious and virtuous pretexts unjust ambitions, baleful wars, and veritable operations of brigandage" (Charles Dupries, *L'Equilibre Europe 'en*, p. 86).

"It takes no account of any other motives of state policy than the personal aggrandizement of rulers and the territorial extension of states. It distributes provinces and rounds off the boundaries of kingdoms without regard to the wishes of populations and their affinities of race, religion, and sentiment" (Lawrence, *Principles of International Law*, p. 129).

Both these quoted by Brown in *International Realities*, p. 208.

power, acknowledging no law of right higher than the necessity of the state and its aggrandizement. For its own ends, individuals and communities were organized and utilized much like tracts of land under intensive cultivation for what they could produce. Wars were often waged, in which the aristocracy were enriched and the people impoverished and sacrificed. Force was the compelling means and justification in the acts of state. In all the supreme matters of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" the state was virtually supreme. The people had only limited rights; those who were servilely obedient were profited and promoted; those who were disobedient and rebellious were ostracized and punished. The old fable of the Lion and the Beasts is a true description of the rule of absolutism. "Thus did the Lion prepare a feast for all the beasts of the field; even the field mice and the moles had their seat and share assigned, each strictly according to its intrinsic merits. But then at the feast the Lion took his Lion's share."

Against such irresponsible, oppressive,

cruel rule the fierce hostility of the anarchist has much justification. The Nihilism of Russia and the present revolutions in Austria and Germany are the natural, if not the logical, outcome of the crushing despotisms of the Romanoffs, the Hapsburgs, and the Hohenzollerns. Grinding despotism and savage brutality provoke fierce outbreaks. The oppressed often strike blindly, wildly, and madly to throw off these shackles. The law of action and reaction operates in the social sphere just as truly and sometimes as remorselessly as it does in the physical. Revolution follows oppression; violence revenges itself upon violence. When the state, the church, and allied institutions are known only as instruments of oppression it is not surprising that the victim should cry out for their destruction. The readiest and most effectual way to liberty for a people who have been in religious, political, and economic bondage is revolution. Only by revolution the anarchist thinks; only by "anarchy," only in "a perfect amorphous society," can there be "a complete manifestation of unchained popular life" and the

“development of liberty, equality, and justice.”

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ANARCHISTIC REVOLUTION

Thus reasoned Michael Bakounine, the father of Nihilism, who with a remorseless logic formulated “The Principles of the Revolution” which have been and are now being carried out with a savage fanaticism. “Admitting no other activity than that of destruction,” he says, “we declare that the forms in which that activity should express itself may be widely varied: poison, poignard, running noose. The revolution sanctifies all means without distinction. . . . The revolutionist is a man under a vow. He ought to have no personal interests, no business, no feelings, no property. He ought to be entirely absorbed in one single interest, one single thought, one single passion—the revolution. . . . He despises and detests existing morality. For him everything is moral that helps on the triumph of the revolution, everything is immoral and criminal that hinders it. . . . Between him and so-

ciety there is war—war to the death. . . . Nevertheless, he must live in the midst of society, feigning to be what he is not. He must penetrate everywhere, among the upper classes as well as among the middle—into the merchant's shop, into the church, into the government offices, into the army, into the literary world, into the detective force, and even the imperial palace. . . . To attain to 'pan destruction' the first requisite is a series of outrages and of audacious and mad enterprises, striking terror into the powerful and arousing the people till they believe in the triumph of the revolution" (Principles of Revolution. Revolutionary Catechism).

ANARCHY SUICIDAL

Such an infernal program is as indefensible as the tyranny from which deliverance is sought. If carried out to its inevitable bloody catastrophe, it would erect upon the ruins of civilization "an inverted Czarism" which would be far more tyrannical and base than any the world has ever known. The destruction of religion and "all exist-

ing morality," the overthrow of the ethical institutions which the goodness and wisdom of humanity have been preparing through the ages, would degrade society into a menagerie of wild beasts. The sweeping condemnation of "all government by man as oppressive," as Proudhon declared, and the conception of the state as necessarily external and hostile to man, overlooks the fact that the state rose out of disorder and violence. With all its imperfections it has rendered man an immense service as a means of protection and development. The anarchist's conception of society without government, "its harmony being obtained not by submission to law or by obedience to any authority but by free agreements," is without any warrant in history or reason. The "State of Nature" in which man was free, in full possession of his natural rights, is an assumption: it never existed save in the mind of Utopian dreamers. Even in the simplest and most primitive conditions there were restraints upon freedom. Brutal passions were constantly bursting forth into deeds of violence; there were collisions of individ-

ual and tribal interests which made the creation of the state imperative. While the state primarily was based upon force and has been maintained partly by force, it has also been in some degree the expression of the will of the community and the work of the moral order of humanity. As civilization advances the state conforms more and more to the pressure of the moral order; it becomes a social organism, growing with the growth of humanity and perpetually ministering to its needs.

DEODORIZED ANARCHISM

There is a deodorized form of anarchism which makes its appeal "from the might of rulers to the sense of right in the individual; from the coercion of the state to the conscience of the citizen; from the law that is penally enforced to the law that is voluntarily accepted." It makes a distinction "between society and the state—between voluntary groups of human beings united by cooperation for the promotion of common interests, and the organized state with its agencies for compelling individuals to

live according to certain rules whether they approve of them or not." That great movement known as Individualism is a part of such social revolt; and conspicuous leaders like Shelley, Emerson, Ibsen, Tolstoy, and others have lent their genius to such appeals and distinctions.

THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF THE STATE

Even Individualism, however, is a partial philosophy, and has broken down in practice. When it is without moral or spiritual polarity, without any higher sanction than individual choice, or any rule of action other than self interest, it is just as truly destructive of society as the fiercer anarchism. The strength of anarchism is in its protest against Machiavellianism; it has little force against the true conception of the state as practically identified with humanity and bound up in the moral order of the world. "The human state," as Von Hügel says, "is based, if not upon brotherly love, yet neither upon force, but upon consent—the seeking and finding of some inchoate justice and interdependence, with force as its aid and sanction.

The state can and does have an end, a responsibility, a repentance, while alive in its connection with human beings. It is understandable, judgeable, improvable, indeed tolerable, only when thus apprehended and operative in its true nature, not as a ruthless machine, but as essentially human, springing from man, leading to man—man who is man only, everywhere only as a creature of flesh *and* of spirit, of force and of justice, and even of love” (Von Hügel, *The German Soul*, pp. 65, 66).

The state is a divine institution just as truly as the church. As Shakespeare says:

“There is a mystery—with whom relation
Durst never meddle—in the soul of state,
Which hath an operation more divine
Than breath or pen can give expression to.”

It is this “mystery,” this Unseen Presence and Informing Spirit, which gives a nation a character, makes it a part of the moral order, and thus disciplines the race to noble service. When this Divine Spirit is quenched the nation loses its sanctity and unity; it becomes an aggregation of warring

interests which seek to establish their predatory rule.

REVOLUTION AND EVOLUTION

Froude, in his *Short Studies upon Great Subjects*, makes this wise observation: "In every country there exist two parties: that which wishes to conserve what is, or even to reestablish what has been; and that which seeks to reform and sometimes in its impatience to destroy everything. Just as the motion of the earth is the resultant of centripetal and centrifugal forces, so society moves on under the combined action of the spirit of conservation and the spirit of reform. Try to suppress them, and you provoke alternately revolution and reactions. Give them free play, and progress will be fulfilled by means of a series of compromises and reforms, as in England, Belgium, and Switzerland."

As Froude intimates, there are in the party of reform these two main tendencies—revolution by violence and evolution by peaceful and political methods. The line of cleavage has not always been maintained.

Revolutionists and reformers have sometimes bitterly opposed each other; at other times both have become opportunists and worked together for a common end, the transformation of society by means of the class struggle. Karl Marx based his philosophy upon social antagonisms as the great outstanding fact of history. "Freedman and slave," he writes, "patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman—in a word, oppressor and oppressed—stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended in a revolutionary reconstruction of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes."

MARX—BAKOUNINE—HERTZEN

This fact of inevitable class struggle, when promulgated by Marx as a doctrine, was regarded as revolutionary and was a slogan with his followers. But Marx was a scholar and combined the spirit of a social philosopher with that of a revolutionist. He reasoned that "at a certain stage of develop-

ment capitalism brings forth the agencies for its own dissolution." There is "a transformation of individual means of production into concentrated ones, of the pygmy property of the many into the huge property of the few, the expropriation of the great mass of people from the soil and the means of production. The number of capitalists decreases, but the number of the proletariat increases, organizes against their oppressors, and substitutes a socialized system of production for capitalism."

Marx broke with Bakounine, the great Nihilist, on account of his violent methods and expelled him from the International. This produced a schism in the forces of social revolt, which has continued until this day. The followers of Marx have in the main been mindful of the dictum of Engels, his associate and collaborator, that "appeals to violence tend to obscure the real development of things." Herten, who with Bakounine believed in the formula, "The spirit of destruction is the spirit of reconstruction," later renounced revolutionary methods and bent his energies to change

men's sentiments. Largely by his writings many reforms, social and political, were accomplished in Russia. His last letter to Bakounine is full of warning and wisdom, which advocates of violence may well heed: "We dash forward following the unknown God of Destruction, and we stumble over broken treasures, rolling confusedly amid the ashes and ruins of all things. But even when the powder shall have blown up the bourgeois world, after the smoke shall have cleared away and the ashes shall have been removed, the world will appear again, modified perhaps, but still bourgeois. And why? Because we are not ready; because neither the constructive mind nor the new organization is sufficiently prepared."

CHAPTER II

BOLSHEVISM AND KINDRED

BOLSHEVISM THE CALIBAN OF POLITICS

BOLSHEVISM has been termed the "Caliban of Politics." It is a queer compound, like that strange creature, which Shakespeare describes in the *Tempest* as "servant-monster, half man, half beast, plain fish, and no doubt marketable." That "servant-monster," coming into contact with Stephano and Trinculo, the dregs of civilization, and drunk with "their glorious liquor," becomes fired with a sudden passion for freedom; he shifts masters and conspires against Prospero, who seeks to establish law and order on that imaginary island. Bolshevism is anarchism, socialism, and democracy—Czarism in a depraved form, and "marketable." It carried out the nefarious schemes of Germany as Caliban did the dirty work for his criminal masters. It is as far below anarchistic idealism as Caliban was

below the honest Gonzago, who dreamed of
a Utopia in which there would be

“ . . . no name of magistrate; . . .
 . . . riches, poverty,
 And use of service, none; contract, succession,
 Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard none;

 No sovereignty.”¹

BOLSHEVISM AND SOCIALISM

No severer condemnations of Bolshevism have been made than by Socialists and Labor leaders. Those of the right wing at least have always opposed the use of violent methods in carrying out their social program. Morris Hillquit, reaffirming the great principle of Engel's that “appeals to violence tend to obscure the real development of things,” declares that whenever any group or section of labor movement has embarked upon a policy of breaking the law or using “any weapons which will win the fight,” whether such policy be styled “terrorism,” “propaganda of the deed,” “direct action,” “sabotage,” or anarchism, it has invariably

¹ The Tempest, Act II, Scene 1.

served to demoralize and destroy the movement, by attracting to it professional criminals, leading the workers to needless and senseless slaughter, and ultimately engendering a spirit of disgust and reaction. It was this advocacy of law breaking which Marx and Engels fought so severely in the International and which finally led to the disruption of the first great international parliament of labor, and the Socialist party of every country in the civilized world has since uniformly and emphatically rejected that policy.”¹

Samuel Gompers, in a recent strike, while attacking industrial autocrats, opposed all Bolshevik methods: “All of you who know me or know of my attitude in regard to labor conditions know my absolute opposition to Bolshevism in theory and to Bolshevism in fact. . . . In theory Bolshevism is an impossibility. In fact, if it were put into operation, or could be put into operation, it would mean the decadence or perversion of the civilization of our time. To me the story of the desperate Samson who pulled

¹ New York Call, November 20, 1911.

the temple down on his head, is an example of what is meant by Bolshevism. I am not willing that all the genius of past ages should be flung to the winds. And I am not willing that the little service that I may have been able to render during the long years that I have attempted to improve conditions in a constructive way should be destroyed by maddened desperation. And so I may say to you that it is well for us to see now that our own house is kept in order."

BOLSHEVISM AND REVOLUTIONS FOR LIBERTY

The Bolshevik conspiracy in Russia is radically different from the democratic revolutions in England, France, and America. Instead of supporting the nascent political democracy it has strangled freedom by means of the army corrupted by German gold as ruthlessly as Czarism ever did. It is Czarism in a depraved form and has put in the place of the old regime the dictatorship of the proletariat, without any of the sanctions or safeguards which mitigated in some degree the old intolerable tyranny. As

Lenin unblushingly said in April, 1918: "Just as 150,000 lordly landowners under Czarism dominated the 130,000,000 of Russian peasants, so 200,000 of the Bolshevik party are imposing their proletarian will upon the mass, but this time in the interest of the latter." Lenin insists upon dictatorship, political and industrial, upon military conscription and the suppression of the press. "We are going," he says, "to smite the journals with fines and shut them up, to arrest the editors and hold them as hostages."

The only resemblance between Bolshevism and the revolutions for popular liberty is in the red froth of terror which neutralized their good effects. Lenin, however, in his incendiary appeal to American working men thus justifies his murderous policy: "Have the English forgotten their 1649, the French their 1793? Terror was just and justified when it was employed by the bourgeoisie for its own purposes against feudal domination, but terror becomes criminal when workingmen and poverty-stricken peasants dare to use it against the bourgeoisie.

Terror was just and justified when it was used to put one exploiting minority in place of another, but terror becomes horrible and criminal when used to abolish all exploiting minorities, when employed in the cause of actual majority in the cause of proletariat and semiproletariat; of working class and poor peasantry. The bourgeoisie of international imperialism has succeeded in slaughtering ten millions, in crippling twenty millions in its war. Should our war, the war of the oppressed and exploited, against oppressors and exploiters, cost a half or a whole million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie would still maintain that victims of the world war died a righteous death and those of the civil war were sacrificed for a criminal cause."

It would be difficult to pack into so few sentences such gross perversions of historic facts and absurd reasoning. The English revolution of 1649 resulted in the public execution of Charles I, than whom Charles James Fox said a hundred and fifty years afterwards, "It is not easy to imagine a greater criminal, . . . for Charles, to a de-

gree which can scarcely be exceeded, conspired against the liberty of his country." Associated with that execution for high treason, and justifying it, are the great names of Algernon Sidney and Oliver Cromwell, who organized the most salutary and enduring democratic movement of modern times. Parliamentary government, equality of rights, equity and law—reforms so essential to human welfare—received a tremendous impulse and were established without any such usurpations and atrocities as those of which the Bolsheviks have been guilty.

There is a striking parallel between the French Revolution of 1793 and the Russian Revolution, not in its first inception, but after it came under the control of the Bolsheviks. The arbitrary rule of a revolutionary committee, the Reign of Terror—the indiscriminate slaughter and confiscation; the horrible irreligion and immorality—all these excesses of the frenzied French revolutionists have been repeated by the Bolsheviks. But these crimes have never been justified by the French, but reprobated by them and by the world. Such horrors are an awful

warning of the retribution which is sure to overwhelm the Bolsheviki, even if their cause were much better than it is.

A dictatorship of the proletariat, which scraps the time-honored checks of besotted power and destroys the safeguards of personal liberty, has always been such an intolerable tyranny that the masses have risen against it and been content afterward for a time to bow their necks to the yoke of their old oppressors.

BOLSHEVISM BREAKING DOWN

Lenin has discovered that neither Bolshevism nor its kindred forms of social radicalism can provide food for a starving people. He won over a part of the peasants by appealing to one of their strongest passions, land-hunger, and incited them to acts of spoliation. They took the land from the rightful owners and divided it among themselves. But neither Lenin nor Trotzky intended that the land was to be privately owned; it was to be socialized and the peasants were to work it under severe discipline. The peasants are becoming disillusionized,

There have been frequent uprisings, and they are only kept in check by the army and by the fear of the return of the old oppressive order. Some day they will exclaim with Caliban:

“What a thrice double ass
Was I to take this drunkard for a god
And worship this dull fool!”

The industrial program of Bolshevism has already broken down and is facing the grim facts of bankruptcy, famine, and plague. Lenin, though a professed follower of Marx, is crying out for the old despised capitalism and for bourgeois experts, offering them high salaries to help him bear his crushing burdens. “In every socialist revolution,” he says, “the main task of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry consists in the positive and constructive work of establishing an extremely complex and delicate net of newly organized relationships, covering the systematic production and distribution of products which are necessary for the existence of millions of people. The possibility of socialism will be determined by our suc-

cess in combining Soviet rule and the Soviet organization of management with the latest progressive measures of capitalism.”

Lenin, however, does not explain how Bolshevism and capitalism, wild exploitation, and the economic system evolved through generations can ever be combined, much less work together.

BOLSHEVISM A PLAGUE

Bolshevism spreads like a plague; it is even more destructive and deadly, for it destroys the soul. It is propagated, not by microbes, which can be killed by disinfectants, but by ideas and lies that inflame the imagination, poison the thought, and corrupt the morals of a people. In Russia it has already broken down the red corpuscles of social health, honor, faith, loyalty, freedom, and produced a moral lassitude and brooding melancholy, which makes the people easy victims of their new oppressors. Lenin says:

“In order to spread our ideas and our influence to the Allied countries we need not wage open war against them nor invade their

territories; the very existence of a Soviet Republic in Russia, based on dictatorship of the proletariat, will serve as an example prompting emulation as a clarion call to arms. . . .

“Capitalism carries on a more effective propaganda for us among the masses than we ourselves could even hope to achieve by our own efforts. The international profiteer is our best propagandist. It is true we owe much to war, but I do not fear peace, for the incurable avidity and corruption of the capitalist classes will survive it and paralyze its healing effects. The cost of living instead of diminishing is still increasing steadily in most countries. The lust of gain of international exploiters, bourgeois financiers, manufacturers, and tradesmen is still unslaked, and they are conspiring to prevent return of normal conditions, totally unconscious of the fact that they are preparing their own destruction.”

The idea of taking over the wealth of society, its lands, factories, mines, railways, etc., to be the property of the masses, and immediately entering into possession, is one

to conjure with. And never did the lure of expropriation have more power than in these tumultuous times when the old oppressors have been overthrown and the crushing burdens of their folly and wickedness have been shifted upon the people, plunging them into greater depths of misery. The state and the church have become infamous, in Russia and in other countries. War with its ruthless destruction of life and property has blunted the sensibilities of many people and made them callous. Conditions are chaotic; everything is in a state of flux. Plague and starvation stare many people in the face. Out of the older order of state sovereignty and capitalism came the greatest of all wars with its yeasting horrors: why not, say the Bolsheviks, have a world revolution, invert the old order and enthrone an industrial democracy in which the workers shall rule?

Emerson said that at Concord in the beginning of the American Revolution "the embattled farmers fired the shot that was heard round the world." But that Revolution was a mere skirmish in comparison with

the war which has overthrown four great autocracies and precipitated the social uprising which is shaking every nation on the face of the earth. The tidal wave of Bolshevism in Russia with its bloody froth of terrorism is rolling westward. Political crises and paroxysms of class hate are making European society heave like a raging sea. Every Cabinet in Europe is fighting for its life; parliamentary government is under fire; the industrial structure has already suffered great changes; and greater changes will surely follow. The atmosphere is lurid and portentous. It is freely said, "Either a League of Nations or chaos." If lawless, class selfishness has so broken down the supports of European governments that they are so weak as this statement implies, a League of Nations will be a vain reliance. If the nations in the Peace Conference are not strong enough to keep their own houses in order, how can they in their collective capacity keep Europe in order? If the League be not a moral evolution instead of a mere compact; if it be not a Federation of that which is best, and only that which is

best, in the nations, how can it keep the worst elements in subjection? The Allies have been strong enough to defeat organized, irresponsible power; are they strong and good enough to overcome the foes of their own households, those selfish, disintegrating forces which are already sapping their strength?

BOLSHEVISM AND AMERICA

America, in spite of herself and against much revered advice, has been drawn into "entangling alliances" with Europe. Our noble dead are there and bind us to the service of whatever vitally concerns humanity, though not to interfere with its domestic quarrels. Humanity's enemies are our enemies. Europe is with us, bone of our bone, blood of our blood, soul of our soul. Its enemies are here. Fourteen millions of foreign-born citizens are domiciled among us. Some of these have contributed immensely to our growth and strength. They have helped us win this war. Others are still aliens in every respect; they speak no other language than their own, read no other news-

papers. Some have taken the Delbück oath of fealty to a foreign power and were actively hostile to us in the war. Three million cases of persons suspected of treasonable practices have been investigated by the United States government. There were many convictions of conspiracy. But only a very few were deported. Of the thousands interned during the war, many are now out on parole. The citizenship of only two overt traitors has been revoked. Some two million or more less offensive traitors are in our midst, who are enjoying the freedom of the country with the fullest opportunity to poison the very currents of our national life. We have strenuously insisted upon the incorporation of the Monroe Doctrine in the Covenant for the League of Nations, barring any foreign power from setting foot upon the American continent, but have freely admitted red-handed Anarchists who are now conspiring to overthrow our republic and establish Bolshevism upon the ruins of democracy.

America has a peculiar and intimate relation with the Bolshevik movement. It

started on the East Side, in New York, a city in which government is as mild as was ever known, and where the people enjoy a perilous degree of freedom. There is freedom of assembly and discussion for Bolshevism and all isms, however foolish or dangerous, provided no crimes are committed against the freedom of others. Five hundred speakers are engaged in the propaganda of Bolshevism and fifteen thousand persons are actively spreading it. Several hundred thousand dollars have been received from the Bolsheviks in Russia to promote the cause of the Reds.

Bolshevism has its creed, its catechism, and carries on systematic courses of instruction. At its meetings this doxology is sung as lustily as the Marseillaise by the French:

“All hail to the Bolsheviks!

We will fight for our class and be free.

A Kaiser, King or Czar, no matter what you are,

You’ve nothing of interest to me;

If you don’t like the red flag of Russia,

If you don’t like the spirit so true,

Then just be like the cur in the story

And lick the hand that’s robbing you.”

There are similar groups of Reds all over the country. A New York State senator, who is a member of the Joint Legislative Committee to investigate Bolshevism, declares "that there is a thoroughly organized plan worked out by the Russian Bolsheviki to seize the reins of government in this country. And the heart and brains of the Red Terror is right here in New York city."

BOUDOIR BOLSHEVIKI

The Bolsheviki of New York city are not by any means confined to the underworld, although from time immemorial every movement that promoted revolution has swept along with it large numbers of the proletariat and criminal classes. The Board of Investigation has facts in its possession implicating possessors of independent income, parlor radicals, and social faddists. There are many persons who are more or less in sympathy with the movement that talk and write on this wise: "I am not a believer in Bolshevism, but"—then follow remarks, partly disapproving and partly justifying, with wild assertions concerning the slavery

of the masses and the necessity of industrial revolution. Anarchistic philosophy is taught under the guise of the "Psychology of the Emotions." The higher and the lower instincts are put on the same plane; neither is to be suppressed, not even if immoral. Freedom from all authority, divine and human, is the ideal good; and to attain this we must "be prepared—to seem unpatriotic, un-American, unreligious, and unmoral." Lectures along this nefarious line are given in a certain school whose aims are defined as "a new trend in social uplift." It has been aptly suggested that a better name for this school would be "The School of Breaking Things Up without Building Them Up."

Members of the Legislative Committee have information showing that "one wing of the Socialist party, the I. W. W.'s, and the Bolsheviki of New York city aim to overthrow the government." There seems to be "a well-concerted plan on the part of the Reds to oust Samuel Gompers and other prominent labor leaders from the trades union movement and place revolutionaries in

control." With the control of the labor unions and the support of millions of discontented workmen; with the stoppage of supplies for the community the Bolsheviki would secure a strangle hold upon society.

BOLSHEVISM AND LABOR

Although Socialists and labor-union leaders have denounced Bolshevism, the left wing of the Socialist party and members of unions have been turning to revolutionary methods and deeds of violence. They have been actively lining up, as one organization says, "with the revolutionary proletariat the world over as at present represented by the policies and tactics of the communistic party of Russia (Bolsheviki), the communistic labor party of Germany (Spartacans)." Rebellion of workingmen against their own trades-union officials is increasing, and agreements between employers and employed have been broken by the latter in spite of the protests of their own representatives.

Labor was never so prosperous as now;

it is better paid, works fewer hours, and in more favorable conditions. Its right to organize and strike is generally recognized; the principle of collective bargaining is widely accepted. Its contention for recognition in the conduct of industry and a larger share in a common product is winning increasing support and has been granted in many places. But there is still much resentment against the present industrial order and a growing impatience with mere reform or with anything short of revolution. Among the I. W. W. and the rebellious members of the trades unions, in the underworld of labor, revolution is raging. "Direct action," "sabotage," "the general strike," "the propaganda of the deed"—the weapons of the Syndicalists are being used with terrible effect.

SYNDICALISM

Syndicalism is trades unionism with a soul of anarchism. It originated in France when a group of anarchists who were being hunted by the French government as outlaws took refuge in trades unions. These

unions then turned to "the general strike as a revolutionary weapon and the only one by which capitalism can be destroyed. At a given signal all members of the trades unions are to leave their work and force others to do so. Production will thus stop; society will be compelled to submit to the domination of the workers, and a new industrialism controlled by the unions will replace capitalism. The government will be in the hands of the workers, and the state as we now know it will pass away."

Georges Sorel, the Karl Marx of Syndicalism, was a pessimist. He believed that society was so evil that it could not be cured by reforms. Optimism is a delusion and a snare. When the optimist is in power he forgets his mission to purge society of its evils. He becomes content with things as they are and lets them take their course. The raging reformer becomes a defender of vested interests and "sleeps down-pillowed, deaf to moaning want." "Capitalist society is so rich," writes Sorel, "and the future opens up before it in such rosy colors, that it bears fearful burdens without making too

loud a complaint. . . . A cowardly bourgeoisie seeks the chimera of social peace."

SYNDICALISM AND MARXIANISM

Miss Jane T. Stoddart, in her review of Syndicalism, shows very clearly how Sorel and Syndicalism diverged from Marxianism. "Karl Marx believed that the present order of society is destined to disappear in a great catastrophe. The path of the destroying angel was, to his mind, as mysterious as that of the secret, hidden forces which produce the earthquake. As a student of economics, he could only prophesy and wait. The modern Syndicalist repudiates the master's fatalistic doctrines. He is not content with the thought that a slow vengeance is gathering like a thunder cloud in some part of the heavens. He wishes to hasten on the emancipation of the toilers, and he sees the remedy for their sufferings in the general strike. The leaders of the new revolutionary party find no pleasure in the dreams and visions of constructive Socialism. The socialistic state, they say, would be an aristocratic, or a bureaucratic government, pre-

cisely like the systems which have preceded it.”¹ The Syndicalists are carrying the same old struggle against the Socialists that the anarchists did. In their opposition to political methods and democracy in general and their reliance upon force Syndicalism and its brother Bolshevism are headed for the same fate which has befallen the anarchists. The residuum of good sense in the masses makes them naturally disinclined to be drawn into the perils of the general strike and the destitution it would entail. They will “strike on the job,” and practice sabotage, but they will not respond to the call for an immediate, violent revolution, save under intolerable tyranny and in exceptional conditions as in Russia. Despairing of winning over the majority, the Bolshevik resorts to desperate acts, which alienate the more enlightened among his followers and arouse the opposition of the lovers of law and order which finally compasses his destruction.

THE BOLSHEVISTS AT SEATTLE

There have been such desperate appeals

¹The New Socialism, Janet Stoddart, George H. Doran Company, Publishers, p. 199.

and deeds here in America. At Seattle, when the nation was putting forth its energies to the utmost to win the war, and where there was the only adequate forest of spruce for the making of aeroplanes, a general strike was planned, which it was confidently believed would precipitate a revolution that would spread like Bolshevism in Russia. The strike was not engineered by the leaders of the trades unions. The American Federation and the International Council had opposed this plan. "The I. W. W. boast that the Russian Revolution was planned in the office of a Seattle lawyer, counsel for the organization, during the three overheated days when Lenin and Trotzky tarried in the city's midst, en route to Russia, and that an American Revolution was planned or at least discussed at the same time." However this may or may not be, tons of Bolshevik literature were distributed containing this among other incendiary appeals: "There is only one way out—a nationwide general strike, with its object the overthrow of the present rotten system which produces thousands of millionaires and mil-

lions of paupers each year. The Russians have shown you the way out."

These appeals were a part of a powerful propaganda by imported agitators, which so roused the animosities and blinded the minds of the people that against their will, as they have since confessed, one hundred and ten Seattle unions voted a sympathetic strike. For a time silence reigned. "Was there going to be violence? And if so, what form would it take?—a peaceful, though universal strike, or a revolution, machine guns and Russia?"¹

Fortunately, by the prompt, resolute action of Ole Hansen, the mayor, the revolution was averted. The working people who had been "buncoed" were stupefied, amazed; then, burning with righteous indignation, they convicted and put in jail the conspirators who had imposed upon them.

There have been many attempts to start revolutions in America and so break down the social order. Anarchists and the vicious classes have done their worst. There have

¹ "They made us strike," Saturday Evening Post, April 12, 1919.

been times when cities have been in their power. But whenever the sober common sense of the people has been aroused they have overthrown their foes and vindicated the strength of popular government. Our institutions when sustained by a prevalent moral life are invincible and have a large vitality amid all corruptions.

CHAPTER III

RUSSIA'S PROBLEM THE WORLD
PROBLEM

THE war has dramatically demonstrated that humanity is one vast social organism, and that "if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it." So long as any nation is diseased and the arterial circulation of good will, common interests, and goods ceases to flow to and from any other nation, the organism does not function well, its health is impaired, and its life endangered.

RUSSIA AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF
NATIONS

Scarcely any member of the world commonwealth of nations is more essential than Russia. She covers one sixth of the earth, includes within her boundaries one hundred different peoples with a population of more than one hundred and fifty millions. In normal times she is one of the greatest producers of raw materials and foodstuffs. The

cutting off this supply is now most severely felt. Her contributions in literature, art, and music have also been of immense value.

The safety and welfare of the world are inevitably bound up with Russia. The head cannot advance so long as the feet are in chains. Her tragic horrors are full of warning. The sinister forces which are more or less hidden and camouflaged in other countries are staged in Russia and shown in their naked deformity and devilish ferocity. The conspiracies which worked in darkness and under surveillance elsewhere swept on to their awful consummation in Russia, with little or no check and indeed by the active support of a treacherous bureaucracy. While the Russians were fighting against half of the German army and nearly the whole of the Austrian army on a front of a thousand miles, this Germanized bureaucracy was corrupting the Russian generals and destroying munitions. Yet against these overwhelming odds the Russians fought for three years, and their dead outnumber those of any nation in the war. Potentially the richest of nations, Russia is now financially

bankrupt. Her industries are paralyzed; her currency has depreciated almost beyond recovery, even under a sane government. Other nations have lent her vast sums and are so short of raw materials and foodstuffs that they will be compelled to help Russia rehabilitate her industries and develop her enormous resources to supply their own and the world's needs.

BOLSHEVISM AN AUTOCRACY AND A UNIVERSAL MENACE

Bolshevism in Russia is a universal menace, like a raging plague anywhere in the world. The infection spreads and strikes nearer and nearer the heart of humanity. As a theory, it is absurd and wicked. In practice, it is like a certain leg of mutton on which Dr. Johnson dined, and which he declared to be "as bad as bad could be; ill fed, ill killed, ill kept, and ill dressed." The Bolsheviki betrayed their country, crushed the Russian Revolution by killing or driving out of the country its friends, compelling them to seek safety in exile. Lenin and Trotzky hated democracy and bent their

energies to establish a communist state under their dictatorship, which should wage relentless war upon all capitalist states.

Bolshevism has the vices without the virtues of autocracy. Its rule is even more absolute and ruthless. According to its constitution the following persons are disfranchised: "(1) persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase of profits; (2) persons who have an income without doing any work; (3) private merchants, trade and commercial brokers; (4) monks and clergy of all denominations." Thousands of persons belonging to these classes have been slain and an enormous amount of property confiscated and destroyed; agriculture and industry are prostrate. Religion and morals are flouted. Absolutism in its most virulent form now holds Russia in its grasp and without any stable or refining influences. The retribution which after many years destroyed the Romanoffs will make short work of the Bolsheviks in accordance with that inexorable law so significantly stated by Shakespeare in his play of *Troilus and Cressida*:

“right and wrong . . .

Should lose their names, and so should justice too.
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.”

Bolshevism everywhere is following the same fatal policy which has always dug the grave of besotted power. It recognizes no higher law than its own greed and no responsibility other than to itself. The collective force of the proletariat, when despotically exercised, is just as tyrannical and subversive of social order as the will of an absolute monarch unless restrained by law and with due regard for the welfare of the social whole. Class warfare, which has been so much glorified in certain quarters, and which at times has been and is justifiable against the usurpations and oppressions of capitalism, is not an unlimited right and may be as treasonable to the community as Germany's assault upon civilization.

Syndicalism, for example, is the applica-

tion to labor of the Machiavellian doctrine of the state which has so often drenched Europe in blood. In its handbook it declares: "When a class issue of any importance is raised, **Might** makes **Right** always and everywhere."

BOLSHEVISM AND THE UNIVERSAL STRIKE

The use of the "universal strike" as the weapon to paralyze the entire economic life of a nation—stopping the production and distribution of food, the running of trains, the mining of coal, etc., until the demands of the workers shall be met—would, if successful, be far more cruel and disastrous than anything Machiavelli ever contemplated. Nothing would be more fatal to the cause of labor and to the laboring classes. Kautsky, the eminent Socialist, who has written so ably and sympathetically concerning the social revolution by evolutionary processes, condemns the universal strike:

"We must not forget that a general strike does not put a stop only to capitalistic production; while it lasts it puts a stop to all production.

“Now, it is much more in the interest of the workers than of the capitalists that production should go on; for the capitalists are not only in possession of the means of production, they also have at their disposal all the great supplies of objects of consumption. Therefore they are able to bear a general stoppage of production much more easily than the workers can. The workers are completely powerless to starve them out” (La Grève Générale, p. 224).

When a general strike was imminent in France and the French working class, under the instigation of anarchists, were tempted to stake everything upon one mad rush against the established order, Jaurés, another great Socialist, gave this impressive warning: “Toward this abyss . . . the proletariat is feeling itself more and more drawn, at the risk not only of ruining itself should it fall over, but of dragging down with it for years to come either the wealth or the security of the national life. If the proletarians take possession of the mine and the factory, it will be a perfectly fictitious ownership. They will be embracing a

corpse, for the mines and factories will be no better than dead bodies while economic circulation is suspended and production is stopped. So long as a class does not own and govern the whole social machine, it can seize a few factories and yards, if it wants to, but it really possesses nothing" (Quoted by Hunter: *Violence and the Labor Movement*, p. 270).

BOLSHEVISM AND LAWLESSNESS IN AMERICA

Abraham Lincoln foresaw the dangers that might result to American society from lawless passions. He said: "If the destruction of the American republic ever comes, it must spring up about us, it cannot come from abroad; we, ourselves will be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide." Lincoln said that this self-destruction would come if at all from "this increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute wild and furious passions for the sober judgment of the courts and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice."

Lincoln uttered this warning in 1837. But lawlessness has since grown immensely among us. The lowest class of immigrant labor has poured in upon us like a flood, and for a time with little or no check or restriction. The I. W. W., who were the forerunners of the Bolsheviks in this country, came with the polyglot crowd, and found in its drifting, suspicious, sullen masses a ready response to incendiary appeals. These workers were oppressed by unscrupulous employers and compelled to live and work in disgraceful conditions. When these miserable toilers in mill and mine were told that the worker should use any weapon which will win his fight, "Since the present laws of property are made by and for capitalists, the workers should not hesitate to break them," it was like scattering "the liquid fire of Jacobinism" among the seething masses of the French Revolution.

THE SPOILER OF LABOR

There was nothing to counteract this nefarious propaganda. No one cared for their souls or for their bodies. Even labor

unions for a time neglected them altogether, and even now leave most of them outside their ranks. It is not surprising that, goaded to fury by their grinding conditions and by unscrupulous agitators, they struck, sometimes blindly and madly, carrying out the schemes of their leaders, rather than helping themselves. W. J. Burns, who brought the MacNamaras and other conspirators to justice, says that "they waged a war of anarchy under the mask of labor."

It is among these ignorant, susceptible, misguided toilers, who are working the most hours, doing the dirtiest work and in the worst conditions for the least pay, that Bolshevism is spreading like wildfire. This enemy of the nation and spoiler of labor must be fought by the most drastic methods. But this great mass of workers upon whom the nation so vitally depends must be reached by a determined friendliness and such ministries as shall most effectively safeguard and promote their physical, moral, and spiritual well-being.

LYNCHING

But lawlessness and Bolshevik practices

are by no means confined to the lower classes. They are in the upper stories of society as truly as in the basement. The crime which makes us most traduced by other nations and is our foulest blot is the barbarous practice of lynching. It is practiced in the older section of the country, where courts are strongly established, where juries are more than willing to convict offenders of a hated race. Several victims of mobs this last year were burned and others tortured before death. Only fourteen of these were killed for alleged attacks on women, and fifteen persons met death who were innocent. These lynchings took place while thousands of Negroes were fighting and dying in Europe for their country and winning the admiration of the Allies for their heroism and noble service. Little or no progress has been made toward the punishment of the lynchers, which is a damaging reflection upon the community. But at this writing there is a National Conference in session at which there are delegates from the South, to take measures to put an end to this monstrous barbarism, which, like all

forms of lawlessness, breaks down the supports of society and produces the conditions in which Bolshevism thrives.

FRENZIED FINANCE

On the high seas of "frenzied finance" civilized piracy for a time flourished with little check. Under the leadership of men of wealth and guided by astute lawyers, corporations were formed which got a strangle hold upon the industries of the country and exacted a tribute from the community. There has been a most effectual reaction and the broken defenses of honest business have been partially repaired. But the moral damage has been terrible. Such colossal examples of predatory wealth in high places have lent a flattering unction to the inflammatory appeals of anarchists and social agitators. A tremendous impetus has been given to the will to wealth and power, and the determination to get quick, easy, big money at whatever cost or consequences to others. It is a common remark that it is useless to enact certain laws because they cannot be enforced; that is, obedience to

laws, though passed by the state and essential to society, will not be rendered and cannot be compelled. Evasion of law by corporate interests, and sabotage openly advocated by Syndicalists—doing as little work and as badly as possible—are breaking down the morale of society just as truly in America as Bolshevism is in Russia.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF LAW THE PRIME ESSENTIAL

The prime essential of Society is the sovereignty of law. Conflicts of classes and interests are inevitable. If these are not mediated and settled by reason, as embodied in law, mob violence follows. Liberty has never been achieved save by the concessions of individuals and classes to give up certain privileges and even rights when they infringed upon the liberties of others. Democracy rests upon the assumption that the people are intelligent, reasonable, and moral, and that their composite judgment carries with it a compulsion which cannot be rightly evaded without impairing the integrity of

the state. The verdict of the majority may not always be right, and, indeed, may be unjust, but, as Lincoln said, "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiment is the only true sovereignty of a people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or despotism."

Law is something more than a body of inflexible rules and regulations. It is the expression of the will of the community and is continually taking the form and pressure of that will. The growing enlightenment and the ripening moral sense of a part of the community at least are continually at work to make and adjust laws to meet the ever-increasing social needs. "Law is mighty, mightier still is need," is a current maxim and one in harmony with the growing sociological concept of jurisprudence. The gift of "conservative innovation" is the best safeguard against the reactionary tendencies which seek to perpetuate predatory rights and it is also the best means of securing a progressive, ordered freedom.

LIBERTY AND CHARACTER

Liberty depends far more upon character than upon rights and privileges or upon social conditions. It may be good or evil according to the dominant disposition of those who use it. Edmund Burke in his *Reflections upon the French Revolution*, and the Red Terror which accompanied it, said: "Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as their love of justice is above their rapacity; in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption; in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good in preference to the flattery of knaves. *Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less there is of it within, the more there must be without.*"

Humanity since the time of Burke has made much progress toward the promised land of liberty which he contemplated. It

has broken away from some oppressions; it has crossed many a Red Sea of revolution, but there is still a long journey before it and many enemies to be conquered. Some nations have more freedom and are much in advance of others. But no backward people or peoples can safely be left behind, much less exploited or oppressed. Such peoples have often overturned society and shifted "the balance of power." In 1815 the Congress of Vienna, consisting at first of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, formed a Holy Alliance to govern for "the protection of religion, peace, and justice," and "the reconstruction of the moral order." But instead of establishing a new order the Alliance sought to strengthen the old absolutism and crush the rising forces of liberty and nationality. But these forces grew and were reenforced in a most unexpected manner. Napoleon, needing money, sold to America the territory now known as the Louisiana Purchase, declaring that he had thereby raised up a competitor to England. But Canning, the English statesman, had a truer vision, when in 1823, speaking of the

rising power of America, he declared that "the New World had come in to redress the balance of the Old."

"THE NEW WORLD TO REDRESS THE BALANCE OF THE OLD"

That prophecy has been most significantly fulfilled. The example of this great and prosperous republic has given wonderful inspiration and strength not only to those whom the old absolutism in Europe sought to crush but to oppressed peoples everywhere. In the last one hundred years eighty constitutions incorporating democratic principles have been adopted. And when America came into this war by the side of England, France, and Italy, the balance of power so long in the grasp of absolutism was shifted into the hands of democracy.

One epoch has culminated; another epoch has begun. Another Peace Congress has assembled and a League of Nations has been formed to establish a permanent peace. But what control will this League have over the Central Powers and one hundred and seventy millions of Slavs? May not they,

representing three fifths of the population of Europe, reverse the preponderance of power, now happily possessed by the Allies, and keep Europe in perpetual turmoil?

The vital bond of any Entente or League is moral—the sense of right, which when strong enough will hold men and nations together as nothing else will. Only nations which have a certain moral development and are homogeneous in character can work together, no matter what their legal agreements may be. Two hundred or more of such agreements and treaties have been made, but many of them have been broken and wars have been frequent.

THE SLAVS AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Much good is expected to come from giving certain peoples the right of self-determination, but democracy has never been a sovereign remedy for certain ills. Can it cure the millions who are burning with the fever of revolution and torn with racial hatreds and class antagonisms? Germany, whether outside or inside the League, will be a menace until she experiences a radical

change of spirit and character. What can the right of self-determination do for the Slavs without certain moral and spiritual conserving forces? The Slavs deserve sympathy and the best gifts of Western civilization. Stung by cruelty, beguiled by German lies, betrayed and bribed by the Bolsheviks, the Slavs are striking madly and blindly as the French did in their Revolution. The Slavs have a sacrificial zeal for liberty which for years has braved persecution, exile, and death. They have a manpower and resources which, if moralized and spiritualized, would enrich and bless mankind immensely, but which, if left to their wild passions and mobilized by the Bolsheviks or resurgent Germany, may become more terrible than the hordes that under Ghenkis Khan and Tamerlane laid waste Europe.

The world is under heavy obligations to the Slavs. They compelled Germany to fight on two fronts for three years. They have sacrificed millions of lives and billions of wealth. How much we owe little Serbia, who has earned the crown of martyrdom in

the cause of the Allies! The Czecho-Slovaks, the countrymen of John Hus, have been fighting our battles against the Bolsheviks! There is Poland, also, the first and the greatest martyr of the nationalist faith in Europe, as France was the first evangelist. In all the republican uprisings in Europe, and in this war, the scattered Poles have fought and died to win for other peoples the nationality which has been denied them.

THE SALVATION OF THE SLAVS

The safety of the world and Christendom depends upon giving to the Slavs the saving forces which have imparted to the Allied nations whatever stable character they now possess and which they must transmit to others or lose their own souls. The peoples of the four big democracies were once in the stage where the Slavs are today. England, after she broke with her despotic King John at Runnymede, had seven hundred years of desperate struggle before she achieved self-government. If the English people, when they were smarting under oppression, had followed Wat Tyler, the Lenin of that day,

their liberties would have been wrecked. But fortunately they were blessed with the leadership of Wiclif, Latimer, Simon de Montfort, and their apostolic successors in church and state, to keep them from stumbling and to lift them up when they did stumble. Our American colonies also in that most critical period just after the Revolution and in several crises since would have been torn asunder by sectional animosities but for the restraining forces of the Christian religion and its regenerating institutions. Every free people has climbed up the same bloody, rugged road.

The Slavs are now on their altar stairs of liberty. They are frantic with hunger, torn with anarchy, and encircled by Bolshevism as by a ring of fire. To leave them to their destruction would be a crime against humanity and a sin against God. That vast Slavic region is the strategic center of the world's politics and of Christendom. The stability of both depends upon the reconstruction and the regeneration of the Slavs.

Germany, with her military power broken, will be all the stronger and able to turn her

entire energies toward economic aggression. Cut off from her former sphere of commercial influence, temporarily at least; shorn of her colonies; her maritime fleet crippled, there remains Russia, the second wheat-producing country in the world and with natural resources sufficient to make any nation that exploits them rich beyond the dreams of avarice and a commercial power of the first magnitude. Russia, dismembered, disorganized, abandoned to internecine strife, will be an easy prey to Germany, whose masterly genius for organization will find a tempting field for unlimited exploitation.

Wherever Bolshevism does not rule reconstruction is already going on, notably among the Czecho-Slovaks and Rumanians. The Russian peasants, who form a large part of the population, are almost wholly anti-Bolshevist. They are incurably religious. The paralyzing grasp of the state church has been broken; the pathetic reverence for the "Little Father" has gone, but the sweet simplicity of their faith in Jesus, the Galilæan Peasant, which led to the conversion

of Tolstoy, remains. Upon this foundation of Christian faith, and upon the Russia of Tolstoy, Turgenieff, and Dostoievsky, may be built the gold, silver, and precious stones of Christian character and a Christian civilization.

THE CHURCH AND GOD'S KINGDOM OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

God's judgment fires are already burning up much "wood, hay, and stubble." God has more at stake in eastern Europe than anyone. Those two hundred millions now scattered and divided—bereft of wise leaders—sustain a vital relation to the kingdom of God, transcending church and state and immanent in both, which has always been cherished by Christendom. That ideal was championed by the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages and for a time rendered an immense service to humanity. It curbed violence and established "a truce of God" at a time when "bloody and disorderly tyranny" was as rampant as it is now in central and eastern Europe. Had that church been true to this divine ideal, to bind

nations and peoples in obedience to and love of Christ, the world would have been spared most of its wars and would need no League of Nations to keep the peace. But in its lust for temporal power the church antagonized every state it could not rule and denied the divine mission of the state. It trampled upon the rights and duties of the state as a part of the moral order of the world. As a consequence the state became degraded into a secular institution, which recognized no higher law than its own necessity and no power other than military force. It became Machiavellian, save where the spiritual life in humanity established free self-governments.

On the other hand, by this alienation of the state the church lost its distinctive character and its primacy in human affairs. Since then there has been no united Christendom and no moral order of commanding authority and power. Europe has been a battle ground of shifting alliances and warring kingdoms, vainly endeavoring by force to preserve a balance of power and keep the peace. But the selfishness of some nation

or nations has always tipped the balance in their favor and brought on war. Out of that fateful separation, not so much between church and state as between a spiritual kingdom and secular forces, backed by sinister interests, have come this war and the present international chaos.

It is a most humiliating fact that the church, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, has become so subservient to encroaching secularism. In Germany and Russia it has given pious sanction to policies and practices which were born in hell. In all countries the church has too often forgotten that it has been invested with the keys of the kingdom of righteousness and commissioned to bind persons and nations into a spiritual society and loose them from the lusts that alienate and destroy them. We sing, "Like a mighty army, moves the Church of God." This is true of the church invisible, but not of the church visible. It has no unified command, no proper subordination of sectarian and secondary interests to an overmastering purpose to carry forward the kingdom of God. Would that the church had the power

to speak in righteousness with one voice and with that compulsive persuasion which the Holy Spirit alone gives!

This is what the nations and humanity in general are travailing in pain for: sure spiritual guidance and control. In a most critical period of the war, H. G. Wells visited France and Italy, and met David Lubin, who was at work upon the very perplexing problem of food supply and distribution. "Their conversation drifted from economic matters, from the ideas of nationalism and faction and policy toward something else which is larger, which they found in the minds of the people. 'The people,' Mr. Wells said, 'are feeling their way toward a bigger rule.' 'The rule of Righteousness,' said Mr. Lubin. Mr. Wells told him that he had been coming to the idea of the whole world as one state and community and of God as King of that state.

" 'But I say that,' cried Mr. Lubin. 'I have put my name to that. And it is *here*.' He seized an Old Testament that lay upon the side of the table and rapped its cover. 'It is here in the Prophets.' "

“That talk,” Mr. Wells says, “was only one of a number of talks about religion that I had had with practical men who want to get the world straighter than it is and who perceive that they must have a leadership outside themselves,” the leadership of a God of righteousness to establish a righteous world order.

CHAPTER IV

ECONOMIC FORCES AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

BENJAMIN KIDD in his posthumous book, *The Science of Power*¹ (p. 53), declares that "The story of creation up to and including human savagery is simply the story of the supremacy in the world of physical force organized in the life of the efficient individual, or the efficient group, or the efficient state. But the story of evolution above savagery is nothing else than the story of the gradual rise to supremacy in the world of those psychic forces organized in civilization which are subduing individuals or aggregations of individuals, efficient in their own interests, to those universal principles which are making for the limitless efficiency of civilization."

THE EVOLUTION OF EFFICIENCY

By efficiency is meant the exercise of en-

¹ Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York City.

ergy, resources, and opportunities to the utmost, fulfilling the law of its being in the conditions in which it is placed. In the climb "up to and including savagery" physical force is supreme and ruthlessly exercised in the exploitation and extermination of others. But even in the jungle, and still more in human life, efficiency depends upon mutual aid and sacrifice. "Those communities which include the greatest number of the most sympathetic members flourish the best," Darwin says. Those communities are the fittest and attain the highest development of intellectual and bodily organization. As life mounts upward to the higher levels, "though the crueler elements persist with fatal and appalling vigor," the altruistic elements gain immensely. Development is carried forward by the power of ideals. It is advanced by a steadily growing sense of right and an ever-enlarging feeling of responsibility which invariably becomes mightier than force. There are whole regions, and daily enlarging regions, where "every animal feature is discredited, discouraged, or driven away."

GERMAN EFFICIENCY AND BARBARISM

This greatest of all wars is an incident in the much vaster, far more fateful struggle of evolution from savagery. The forces of an animal, barbarous, and pagan past have warred against the growing soul of civilization. By a one-sided, perverted application of the Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest the law of the jungle in its crueler aspects has been projected into human society. Basing its right to rule upon this law and buttressed by the Machiavellian doctrine of the state, Germany has sought to impose its *Kultur*, which is its standard of efficiency, upon the rest of mankind. No other nation has so effectually subordinated religion, philosophy, and a submissive people to its ruthless designs; none has so completely crushed its idealism and spiritual life by its idolatry of force and its lust for power.

But, as Mr. Kidd says: "The pagan doctrine of force as the supreme test of efficiency in the world, which has come out naked and unabashed in modern Germany, had its

springs deep down in the tendencies of the intellectual life of every leading Western nation. . . . Since 1880 the Western nations entered on the scramble for the world outside of Europe, engaging in what has been called 'the most rapid and vast career of acquisition that the world has witnessed since the days of Islam.'"¹ The balance of power, which ruled Europe for a hundred years, was based, not upon reason or justice, but upon force and practices which often outraged the moral sense of mankind.

WAR AND INDUSTRIAL CONFLICTS

Closely allied to this struggle between nations for power and territory was the determination within nations by individuals and groups to get wealth by the most effective methods, and often in violation of ethical laws. In war and in industrial conflicts society is nearest to the barbarism from which it has emerged. In these spheres the predatory instincts and practices of a lower stage survive in their full vigor. The altruistic feelings, the ethical and spirit-

¹ The Science of Power, p. 66, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

ual powers, however, are less active and when asserted are often flouted. They derive their strength, not from a brute inheritance, but from the quickening of the spiritual nature by the ideals imparted by a slowly ripening social consciousness.

The system of capitalism, which dominates industry, though an immense advance in efficiency upon every economic system preceding it and in its contribution to the general material well-being of society, was frankly based upon selfishness. It offered a tempting opportunity to those possessing the resources and tools necessary to production to exploit labor. In the famous debate between Schmoller and Treitschke, when Schmoller said that the present social order rose out of force and injustice, Treitschke replied: "What does force and injustice arise from? From the natural inequality of men themselves. Nature made some men stronger than others. Before we had an organized society the stronger killed the weaker. When we had a slightly organized society, it made slaves of them. Now it uses them as free laborers."

Capitalists in general, with none of the obligations imposed by feudalism, seized upon the economic advantage afforded by the emancipation of serf labor, and used the power which wealth gave, shutting out ethical and humane considerations. They adduced the ruling economics to justify their practices.

THE SCIENCE OF ECONOMICS AND ITS PERVERSIONS

But Economics as taught by Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Alfred Marshall, and others is not the narrow, unethical system that those capitalists practiced. It belongs to a larger science, and the material forces with which it deals are conditioned by the psychic forces which give form and pressure to society. Adam Smith was a professor of moral philosophy and there is no contradiction between the wealth of nations and his moral teachings. Alfred Marshall emphasizes the effect of the Reformation in deepening English character, "reacting upon their habits of life and giving tone to their industry. . . . The isolation of each

person's responsibility from that of his fellows, rightly understood, was a necessary condition of the highest spiritual progress. . . . Holland and other countries shared with England the great ordeal which was thus opened by the spiritual upheaval that closed the Middle Ages. But from many points of view, and especially from that of the economist, England's experiences were the most instructive and the most thorough, and were typical of the rest. England led the way in the modern evolution of industry and enterprise by free and self-determining energy and will."¹ Capitalism as it has been practiced and as it is has been represented by some critics is as far removed from the true science of economics as the Machiavelian doctrine of the state is from the true conception of the state. Professor Marshall speaks of "the many hangers-on of the science, who had no reverence for it, and used it simply as an engine for keeping the working classes in their place. Perhaps no great school of thinkers has suffered so much from the way in which its hangers-on and

¹ Principles of Economics, vol. i, p. 63, The Macmillan Co.

parasites, professing to simplify economic doctrines, really enunciated them without the conditions to make them true.”¹ Industrial lords seized upon certain narrow economic abstractions to lend a flattering unction to their predatory practices in much the same way that despotic monarchs used Machiavellian maxims to justify their usurpations and aggressions.

Irresponsible power, exercised for industrial aggrandizement, by its singleness of purpose and concentration of force, like other despotisms, was immensely successful for a time. But later, by an inexorable law, oppression generated the vices which undermined its strength and roused the opposition which compelled the captains of industry to bow to the will of an aroused social conscience. The greed which forced men, women, and children to work twelve to sixteen hours a day, in mines and mills, in conditions fatal to health and morals, produced such a frightful amount of social wreckage that the famous Factory Acts were necessary to safeguard society. Wage-earners,

¹ Principles of Economics, vol. i, p. 35, The Macmillan Co.

on the other hand, smarting under injustice, used force to resist force, and by strikes, sabotage, and other drastic methods have wrung concessions from their employers and enforced their claims to a larger share of a common product.

THE DISLOCATION OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

Thus was produced a dislocation of the social order which has steadily widened. A dualism between religion and business, ethics and economics has prevailed, save where it has been mediated by the altruistic feelings and practices of individuals and groups. In spite of beneficent legislation and noble reforms to bridge the chasm, the social cleavage has deepened and industrial conflicts have become more formidable. During the years immediately preceding the war the portents of an approaching social convulsion in England and on the Continent of Europe became alarming. At the time of the railroad strike in 1911 England was in danger of starvation. The London Times declared that the country was "facing the decomposition of society." The settlement

of this strike instead of bringing peace stimulated new forces of revolt, which projected their offensive beyond local groups and into whole industries. Trades unions and social legislation, though increasingly effective, no longer satisfied the demands of labor. A sinister disposition to disregard the sanctity of agreements became manifest and "legal contracts entered into by labor were continuously violated as if they had meant nothing at all."¹

Before the war Professor Marshall stated that "if wealth were distributed equally, the total production of the country would only suffice to provide necessities and the more urgent comforts for the people, and that as things are, many have barely the necessities of life. . . . The average increase per head in the United Kingdom, which was about £15 in 1820, is about £33 now; i. e., it has risen from about £75 to £165 per family of five. There are not a few artisan families, the total earnings of which exceed £165, so that they would lose by an equal distribution of wealth: but even they have

¹ London Times, January 26 and March 27, 1912.

not more than is required to support a healthy and many-sided life.”¹ Though the proportion per capita of wealth in the United States is larger,² the net output of production before the war was barely adequate to provide a proper measure of subsistence and comfort for the whole population even if it had been equally distributed. In both countries it is estimated that industry attained only about fifty per cent of its possible efficiency. There was much wasteful and destructive competition between employers and between employers and employees. Many “captains of industry” were autocratic and self-sufficient, wholly intent upon gaining their own ends as they narrowly and selfishly conceived them. This “dark spot” of selfishness blinded them to the self-evident truths, that no man has any more right to run his business as he pleases than the Kaiser had a divine right to rule and make war; that the needs and grievances of labor must be recognized and adjusted before there can be any

¹ Principles of Economics, pp. 45, 146, The Macmillan Co.

² The total wealth of the United States is estimated at \$250,000,000,000, and the total income \$50,000,000,000.

real cooperation which is essential to the greatest efficiency. Trades unions leaders, on the other hand, were chiefly exercised in forcing concessions from employers and protecting their members from aggression. Various methods of slowing up production and sabotage were encouraged. Syndicalists were busy stirring up envy, hatred, and hostility promoting craft interests instead of a community of service, without which the real welfare of labor cannot be advanced.

THE PSYCHIC FORCES IN INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY

When the war broke out and England was compelled to fight for her existence, she was confronted at home by gross profiteering on the part of capitalists and by widespread strikes by labor. Industries which were vital to the prosecution of the war were stalled. Then came the appeal to something higher than the issues of class warfare, to their common loyalty to a common country upon whose salvation everything which these classes held most dear depended. An industrial armistice was effected. Animosities

were held in abeyance. The precious freedoms and concessions which labor had gained after years of bitter struggle and sacrifice were temporarily surrendered. A common allegiance was recognized. The productive forces of the nation for the first time were mobilized, not for profit, but for the maximum output. England, the country of individualism, the battlefield of class struggle, in order to match her whole strength against Germany, the empire, where politics, commerce, and industry had been fused in a single conspiracy for world domination, was compelled by her "Defence of the Realm Act," to commandeer private factories and property for war purposes and impose the most drastic regulations in regard to the luxuries, the food, and many activities of her people.

In the United States also the conduct of industries and many of the activities of the people were under public surveillance and determined by the necessities of the war. Here, as in England, there was a general loyal response and cooperation. Judge Edwin B. Parker, the Commissioner

of Priorities of the War Industries Board, declares, that "in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred there was a spontaneous and enthusiastic support. There is the exceptional case of the man who is determined to 'run his own business' regardless of the nation's crisis and her most vital needs. But would you call such a man democratic? It seems to me that he has been a petty autocrat for so long that he is unable to break the spell. He has been using our precious resources, employing human beings in his service, and holding a natural monopoly perhaps in some necessities of life, and still for all this he acknowledges no responsibility. He represents the idea which America has set out to destroy—the rule of the irresponsible. . . . Before the war, the test by which the continued existence of an industry was determined was, 'Does it pay?' To-day our only question is, 'To what extent does it serve the nation's need.' We have to quit production simply for private profit and begin to produce for national use."¹

As a result of this new spirit of coopera-

¹ Quoted in *The Great Chance*, Charles W. Wood.

tion many necessary economies and efficiencies were discovered and adopted. New energies were released and a production surpassing all past experience was achieved. In England "after two years, during which four million men, or nearly one third of the adult able-bodied male population, had been drafted into the fighting services, while something like two million more had to be added for the special requirement of the munition trades, the ordinary trades of the country were still able to be carried on so as to supply the material requisites of life for the remaining civil population upon a level not appreciably lower than before the war. The production of material wealth as a whole (inclusive of munitions and other material war requisites) did not appear to have been diminished by the withdrawal of four million men."¹

During the war industry received a much needed moral quickening and developed a social conscience. The appeal of patriotism goes deep into the very consciousness of the people and stirs men more profoundly

¹ John Atkinson Hobson, *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*.

than economic issues. The loyalty to country, in which and by which people live, was signally manifest long before modern industrialism. It is out of the souls of men that the great changes of society and the social evolution of mankind proceed. "Man cannot live by bread alone." Still less can he feed upon his self-interest and exercise his economic advantage exclusively without experiencing revulsion of feeling. When his soul is stirred, he feels the moral forces in the bosom of humanity, which though often turned aside or smothered, always have moved the world and always will. It is only when the pursuit of gain is ennobled by ideal aims and impelled by moral motives that it commands man's best energies and becomes a worthy vocation.

The president of a great steel company said the other day: "When a man or a number of men for their own ends create a great industrial unit they assume an obligation towards the human elements of that unit and through them to society in general, which cannot be canceled or suspended arbitrarily." The human factor whose import-

ance this steel magnate emphasizes is coming to be recognized as the most potential one in industry. Economic forces: capital, material resources and processes, the machinery of production and exchange—these are essential factors and are sometimes ignored by reformers. But man, who is much more than a component part of a big working machine; man, made of flesh and spirit, with a primal, divine urge in him to live a fuller life and master conditions so as to develop such life; man in his social membership, upon which industry and society really depend, determines the value and the character of industry.

Capitalism is constantly changing under the pressure of the human factors with which it is identified. It is an evolving system. There was a time when the laborer was regarded as a commodity, subject like other commodities to the law of supply and demand. But there was such an impoverishment of labor force and so much social wreckage that considerations of even economic efficiency compelled progressive business to study the workman as a human

being. His physical and social needs, his rights and aspirations, what will make him contented and win his cooperation—these became vital business problems, which press for solution with increasing persistence.

INDUSTRY AND THE SOCIAL WHOLE

The vital relation of the industrial unit to the social whole is also commanding increasing attention. Industry depends for its very existence and protection upon the community. It cannot thrive in a lawless, ignorant and vicious people, as the experiment of Bolshevism in Russia has demonstrated. All that is most essential to industry: power of brain and brawn, the machinery of production and exchange, science in its endless applications, the market for its products—all these, with the psychic forces which develop with the growth of civilization, are furnished by the community.

BIG BUSINESS MORE HUMAN AND DEMOCRATIC

Big business is becoming not only more human but more democratic. Collective

bargaining, conferences and arbitration of disputes, welfare work, profit-sharing, distribution of stock among employees, and similar methods are attempts to give a larger recognition to workers and a greater share in the profits of business. But something more than higher wages, fewer hours, better working conditions, and a share in the profits is necessary to satisfy workers who are imbued with the democratic spirit. Their fundamental grievance is that they are dependents; they have no ownership; or if in a few corporations they are stockholders in a small way, they have in most business concerns no voice in the conduct of the industry to which they give their energies and often their lives. They are exposed to the insecurity of a competitive industry with the dangers of unemployment and poverty staring them in the face. *Things are regulated for them as in an autocracy, and not by them, or at least with their cooperation, as a democracy requires.* The only bond between them and their employers is "the cash nexus," in the form of wages. They have no ownership or share in a common product

save in a few exceptional industries and by a comparatively small contingent. Thousands of workers have fought to overthrow a political autocracy and free mankind from the domination of irresponsible power. They naturally feel hostile toward anything which looks like Prussianism in business.

NO HEREDITARY INDUSTRIAL AUTOCRACY

There is, however, no hereditary industrial autocracy. Four fifths of the "captains of industry" have risen from the ranks and against more formidable obstacles than now exist. To give one example among thousands: Charles P. Steinmetz, the manager of the General Electric Company, says in his preface to his book, *America and the New Epoch*:¹ "When I landed at Castle Garden, from the steerage of a French liner, I had ten dollars and no job, and could speak no English. Now, personally, I have no fault to find with existing society; it has given me everything I wanted; I have been successful professionally, in engineering, and have every reason to be personally satis-

¹Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

fied; . . . Even as crude and undeveloped as the industrial corporation of to-day is, in its social activities, if I were an unknown and unimportant employee I would far rather take my chances with the impersonal, huge industrial corporation than with the most well-meaning individual employer." There is something in man that is superior to circumstances and there is something in the hardships and hazards of industrial competition which challenges and helps develop men's powers. The prizes in the industrial world as a rule are held by men who were poor and have mastered its conditions.

Socialistic communities, on the other hand, where the competitive element has been partly or wholly eliminated, have failed to produce either men or wealth for anyone. There are some sane principles of socialism, however, which could be wisely applied to the conduct of industry. Mr. Steinmetz calls himself a Socialist and would extend still more fully the principle of cooperation which has helped make industrial cooperations so strong and profitable alike to capital and labor, and which he insists is essen-

tial to enable America and England to attain such a high degree of commercial efficiency as Germany by the help of state Socialism achieved before the war. That state Socialism, however, was a masterly combination of capitalism with political and educational forces.

The men who are really doing the most to democratize industry are not Socialists or trades unionists, but those who are prominently identified with the big corporations. The beginnings of a representative democracy, with constitutional rights and privileges to all workers, have already been made. The International Harvester Company, for example, has a plan which provides for "a works council" in which representatives elected by the employees shall have equal voice and vote with the management in the consideration of matters of mutual interest. "Through these councils any employee or group of employees or the management may at any time present suggestions, requests, and complaints with the certainty of a full and fair hearing." There are some twenty articles in this industrial constitution, which

was voted upon by thirty thousand employees in March of this year and adopted.

BEGINNINGS OF AN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Other similar plans are in operation by the Standard Oil Company. During the twelve months that the plan introduced by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey has been tried there have been eighty joint conferences between the workers and the management; one hundred and nineteen different subjects came up for discussion and all were amicably settled by the employee and company representatives. Wages have been increased, life insurance has been placed for all the workers, and detailed plans have been formulated for old age and service annuities.

THE PROBLEM OF PRODUCTION FOR CAPITAL AND LABOR

Industrial democracy obviously would be doomed to failure, if it did not recognize and keep in its administrative positions men of demonstrated business ability and experience. Genius has its place and is entitled to its rewards in business as truly as in art

and literature and science. The best Socialists recognize this, and also the economic necessity of the promotion of workers for merit instead of leveling them down. Certain economic laws have a sovereign sanction and validity. They cannot be supplanted by popular vote, nor can the conduct of business be safely put into the hands of demagogues. The problem of sufficient production to meet the increasing demands of labor for higher wages, fewer hours, and better conditions must be solved on economic grounds. "The theory advanced by some advocates of shorter hours of labor, that the reduction of hours does not mean an equal reduction in products, fails to apply to the textile industries, because the work is done largely by machinery. The work of the laborers is to keep the machines supplied with material, to attend to the machines, and to remove the products. The machines are already run at the highest speed possible for good work. Consequently, the alertness or quickness or willingness to work on the part of the workers cannot increase the output of the machine. . . . It is impossible to run

the machines with two or three shifts, because a large proportion of the workers are women and children and the labor laws of Massachusetts prohibit them from working at night. A reduction of twelve and one half per cent of working hours means a reduction of twelve and one half per cent of product, but the overhead expenses remain the same. So the cost of production per yard is increased with every reduction of hours. In those industrial activities, however, where the individual factor is greater than the mechanical, the theory that the volume of production can be maintained with a shorter working day, holds true."

Labor has reasoned that if values are determined by the law of supply and demand, then the less the work performed the more valuable labor will be, the more continuous the work, and the less danger of unemployment. Hence, trades unions have adopted the policy of restricting output, by slowing up the workers and opposing the introduction of labor-saving machinery. This mistaken policy is one of the causes why England before the war, where this policy was

most generally in force, developed only about fifty per cent of her labor efficiency and was greatly handicapped in her commercial competition with Germany. The controlling factor in determining the value of labor is the amount of marketable goods produced and at such a cost as consumers can afford to purchase. The fear of unemployment, however, is a force that must be met in such a way that the burden shall not fall wholly upon labor. Such guarantees should be given that the workers shall be encouraged to give their utmost energies to make production as large as possible, which is their most effectual safeguard, and at the same time be provided with sufficient insurance to tide them over the evil day, when it does come. England has already taken a step toward this end. At the time of this writing one million persons are receiving their unemployment dole.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND THE COMMUNITY

The class struggle, which Socialists and others have declared to be the norm of civili-

zation, cannot be settled within the industrial unit and upon economic grounds alone. Economic forces are constantly being overborne by national and racial interests; and these interests in turn bow to the superior claims of humanity. Before the war the Socialists of Europe were banded together in the International and fondly believed that this bond of fraternity was stronger than all others, even strong enough to prevent war. But when the appeal to patriotism was made, the Socialists in the various countries rushed to the colors and fought against one another on all fronts. No struggle for freedom has ever been won by any class without enlisting the help of other classes, and indeed, of some members of the very class against which it was fighting. The bond of the alliance thus formed was more human than economic. No great advance for humanity has been made without the cooperation of "psychic forces, organized in civilization, subduing individuals or aggregates of individuals efficient in their own interests to those universal principles which are making for the limitless efficiency of civilization."

The industrial strife and bitterness which have become so formidable and are shaking the supports of society can never be overcome without the cooperation of the community. The psychic forces, which have been developed largely in the family, the state, and the church, must be applied to the industrial member. Industrialism has insulated itself in many cases from ethical restraints and social obligations. The community has been exploited and its rights ruthlessly trampled upon. It has been long suffering and much too kind. It is high time that the community in which the ownership of so much of the natural resources is vested, and upon whose will the very life of industry depends, should insist upon its rights. The fixing of prices and wages without regard to the public; the increasing disposition on the part of corporations to compel consumers to pay tribute and on the part of the proletariat to conscript wealth by taxation, are as fatal to economic efficiency as they are to social solidarity. The effrontery of syndicalists in enforcing their claims not only by curtailing profits but by

“the universal strike”—by holding up the community by the stoppage of supplies—is treason of the worst sort.

THE SUPREME CLAIMS OF “A GREATER,
HAPPIER, AND BETTER HUMANITY”

The human obligations within industry and to the larger life of the community are the invisible ties which hold society together. When these obligations are weakened, when the arterial circulation of common ideals, feelings, and interests is poor, “there is schism in the members”—the social body is torn by its contending factions. Clémenceau, speaking about the program of the Peace Conference, said, “It is no longer the peace of a more or less vast territory, no longer the peace of continents; it is the peace of nations that is to be made.” We must be ready to make any sacrifice, but “on the condition that we endeavor impartially to conciliate interests, apparently contradictory, on the highest plan of a greater, happier, and better humanity.” The spirit of self-sacrifice and conciliation which the French premier declared to be essential to the estab-

lishment of international peace is just as truly essential to industrial peace. There must be the conciliation and cooperation of groups and interests, "apparently contradictory" and now hostile, by making them feel the wisdom and power of "a greater, happier, and a better humanity."

CHAPTER V

PROPERTY AND THE SOCIAL
ORDER

PRIVATE property has a divine sanction and is one of the oldest of human institutions. It has enlarged the scope of human personality and has been a potent factor in binding individuals and groups into communities and nations. Communistic experiments have failed. Most Socialists now admit the necessity and worth of this time-honored institution and give it a place in their programs for collective ownership and production.

THE RIGHT TO PROPERTY

Many theories which have been adduced to justify the right to property base this right upon force, possession, or acquisition, irrespective of moral relations and obligations. But these objections are conclusive: "The arbitrary seizure of a thing cannot

become the ground of a right to it; the momentary possession of a thing still less can become the ground of a continuous right; and the title of acquisition is not the basis of property, but the property is the basis for the title. . . . Occupancy and labor and law are indicative of possession on the ground that apart from them the necessity and justice of property exist."

Mulford, in his great book, *The Nation*, after a critical review of the conventions concerning the right to property, comes to this noble conclusion: property "is man's only as his personal being; that is, his life in its moral realization is from God, and it is his in and for the fulfillment of his vocation in a moral order in the world, and apart from this there is nothing which is his own. . . . If property becomes in itself an end, then personality is subjected to the things it possesses. If it be held apart from the vocation of man and the moral relations and obligations involved in that, then it becomes mere possession; the instrument of a selfish interest and the means for the degradation of personality."

THE BIBLICAL CONCEPTION OF PROPERTY

Mulford's conclusion, that the right to property comes from God as the Creator and Sovereign of the earth, is a fundamental truth of the Bible. The Scripture passage "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof" is no mere rhetorical phrase, but the expression of supreme reality. God owns the world in fee simple. All material substances and forces, all human powers and rights, are his gifts, and conditioned by his moral order. Man, by virtue of his divine endowment as a spiritual being, is given dominion over the physical world. His vocation is to use it in fulfillment of the Divine purpose and thus work out his own development and destiny.

David's prayer, which was offered at the building of the temple, reveals the Hebrew conception of property as God's gift, to be held in trust for his use in the realization of his Kingdom upon the earth and in the exercise both by men and nations of their high calling and stewardship. "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power. . . .

Both riches and honor come out of thee, and thou reignest over all. . . . Who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee. . . . O Lord our God, all this store . . . cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own. . . . O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel our fathers, keep this forever in the imagination of the thoughts of the heart of thy people, and prepare their heart unto thee."

The spirit of this prayer is supreme in the Law and the Prophets. This spirit shines all through the history of that chosen people, blessing them when they were obedient and justifying its wisdom by the degrading abominations and disasters into which they fell when they were disobedient. When Israel turned away from the worship of the unseen righteous God and bowed down to idols; when they broke the obligations which the possession of property entailed, the bond that made those nomad tribes a people with a God-given mission was weakened. Their hold upon the righteous-

ness of God and his moral government being loosened, all lower sanctities and rights lost their force. Religion degenerated into ceremonialism. Only partial service and sacrifice were required. Might usurped right. Property divorced from a divine sanction became a means of selfish aggrandizement and an instrument of oppression. The concentration of wealth, without moral restraint, brought its inevitable concomitants—the debauchery of the rich and the impoverishment of the poor. Nothing saved Israel from the fate of the surrounding idolatrous nations but the burning protests of the prophets speaking with divine authority, recalling them to the worship of a righteous God and obedience to his moral order.

JESUS AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

Jesus came to reveal more fully and persuasively the unseen Sovereign and Father to whom the Law and the Prophets sought to bind that believing, but doubting and sinful, people. Jesus was primarily a revealer. He was not a social agitator against the intolerable political and eco-

conomic tyranny under which humanity was then groaning. If Jesus had yielded to the popular clamors of his day and had incorporated into his gospel a social program to remedy the oppressive conditions of Palestine and the ancient world, his revelation of an invisible kingdom whose Sovereign wisdom would be justified by its universal application and realization would have been obscured and would have lost its unique redemptive character. The world-embracing, regenerating principles of Jesus cannot be compressed into social dogmas, much less into class slogans. As Mazzini said, "Christ came for all; he lived for all; he died for all."

Every age cries out for some sovereign specific to cure its peculiar evils. Drastic legislation and methods are demanded, but often the fundamental rights upon which the very structure and stability of society rest are violated. Mayor Hansen, of Seattle, Washington, was asked by a New York newspaper for a fifteen-hundred-word article on the laws he would propose to curb Bolshevism in America. He denied the request and

said: "Laws might be enacted which, while meeting the present emergency, would threaten the rights of the American people; it was better to wait till calmness and deliberation could take the place of furor and tumult." Bolshevism is an epidemic due to diseased social conditions. Drastic methods are necessary to curb its violence and check its spread, but the cause lies too deep for laws to cure.

GOD'S RIGHTEOUS ORDER

The crying need of that ancient world and of these tumultuous times is God's righteousness established in the minds and hearts of mankind. When this righteousness is sought and obeyed, ethical and social potencies of marvelous efficacy are released. They work from within outward and give quickening and strength to other similar forces. "The presence of electrical force in one body," we are told, "induces a corresponding force in another not in contact with the first, but adjacent to it; currents passing in a given direction communicate new properties to a body round which they

circulate; the neutral iron becomes a magnet attracting, vibrating so long as it is encircled by a galvanic current." Similarly, the power Jesus received from God was imparted to his disciples. This spiritual current spread, communicating intensity and new properties to other ethical potencies, more or less remote from it. Like the forces of nature, it has always been available and responsive to human needs and cooperation.

"The world was out of joint" then, and it is still. No political and social reconstruction could or can set it right, so long as disruptive forces were and are raging. The kingdom might have been restored to Israel, the Roman yoke thrown off and a treaty of peace concluded. But God's righteousness could be established only so far as the insurgence of self in the heart of humanity at enmity against the divine order was conquered and transformed. No reform would be effectual with a wicked and an adulterous generation which worshiped false gods, enthroned might over right, and organized the forces of human strength under the Prince of this world against the Right-

eous Ruler. The strangle hold which sin had upon humanity must be broken before society could be saved.

The prime essential and dynamic for the regeneration of society then and now is God's love incarnate in Jesus Christ, who took upon himself our flesh and infused into those who received him a new purifying, transforming power which remakes men and enables them to remake society into the kingdom of God.

THE OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY AND ITS OBLIGATIONS

What does this Divine Love as revealed in Jesus require in respect to the ownership and use of property, which is the storm center of so much of the evil in the world? Jesus accepted without criticism the institution of private property as he did other institutions of society. He evidently did not regard its possession, or wealth, as an infringement upon the rights and welfare of others, still less as the cause of poverty and misery. However faulty or unjust the structure of society may have been at times,

it has been imperiled whenever the sacredness of private property has been violated save for the benefit of the social whole. Wealth, when it is earned, is an achievement due to faithfulness over a few things in a minor sphere and is entitled to its reward. It is accompanied by virtues or vices according as certain higher laws are obeyed or disobeyed. It may minister to the beauty and gladness of life or increase its miseries. It is the way in which a man gets or uses or spends his wealth; it is the place it has in his thoughts and affections, which determines his character. Like knowledge, which often fosters pride and the desire to dominate others; like religion, which so easily degenerates into hypocrisy and persecution; like any other good, which may be debased, wealth has its perils which none escape and few pass through unscathed. The strain and stress of acquisition; the preoccupation with one's possessions; the covetousness which it breeds, the vices which it engenders—these often impoverish the real life of men and dry up its springs. Only he who is athletic of soul can endure the grueling test. But

if he does endure it, he gains greater moral power and even spiritual blessedness, as the parable of the talents teaches.

No sin, save possibly hypocrisy, which is an abuse of a real good, was treated by the Master with such withering scorn as covetousness. Nothing was so severely condemned as indulgence in selfish splendor in the midst of moaning want. Retribution is pictured as falling like a crack of doom upon the rich fool who lived in luxurious ease, and also upon Dives, who in hell lifted up his eyes in torment and beheld Lazarus in heaven, the accusing witness of his brutal selfishness. On the other hand, one of the meanest characters in the gospel is the man who hid his one talent, the I. W. W. who produced nothing, lost his ability and opportunity, and was cast as an unprofitable servant into outer darkness.

THE SIN OF LUXURY

Flaunting luxury in the presence of poverty and misery is a deadly sin and a pernicious perversion of property. Unproductive consumption of wealth, the

diversion of labor to the production of articles many of which not only supply no real need, but are injurious, is a prolific cause of poverty. In a well-ordered household it would be considered monstrous and brutal if the father or mother should spend so much of the common patrimony in selfish gratifications that the rest of the family should suffer for the necessities of life. If a company of persons should be gathered together at the banquet where the provisions were barely sufficient to give each a moderate share, and a few greedy persons should help themselves so plentifully that there would not be enough left for the others, those greedy persons would be regarded as boors. But in every city there are hundreds of idle rich, *idle rich*, who produce nothing, but consume so much from life's common table that only a few crumbs are left for the many who are continually on the verge of starvation.

Professor Cairnes, an able English economist, writes in reference to the extravagant expenditures of the idle rich: "The wealth accumulated by their ancestors or others on their behalf, when it is employed as capital

in productive enterprises no doubt helps to sustain industry. But what they consume in luxury and idleness is not capital, and helps sustain nothing but their own unprofitable lives. By all means they must have their rents and interest as it is written in the bond; but let them take their proper place as drones in the hives, gorging at a feast to which they have contributed nothing. This does not apply to the industrious rich, but it does condemn their luxury."

PREDATORY WEALTH

The war has made parasitic and predatory wealth as odious and as treasonable as Prussianism. The slacker and the profiteer are social outcasts. Property rights, and even some precious personal freedoms, are justified only when subordinated to the good of the whole. The obligations that possession entails, which the Bible has taught, and have been observed by spiritual-minded men in all ages, are becoming accepted and applied by an awakened social conscience. All that enters into wealth—natural substances and forces, the powers that organize and

drive industry, the machinery of production and exchange, the laws and institutions of society which generations have developed and transmitted—all these, without which the acquisition or the possession of property would be impossible, are God-given and maintained by society. No individuals or corporations own the product, and they have no right to administer it in any way that violates the character of God or militates against his rule in human affairs. “Whatever hinders the attainment of a true and full humanity on the part of every man or woman ought to be removed, and whatever is essential to the very existence of human beings as our Father in heaven means them to exist, ought to be supplied and made possible to all.”

The drastic discipline of these tragic years, when civilization has been trembling in the balance, has driven home the conviction that all rights and possessions depend for their validity and perpetuity upon their relations to God’s moral order. In cooperation with him these lower forces and possessions may prosper; without him they fail.

"The fashion of this world," with its idolatries and perversions of God's order, "passeth away." The lust of the flesh, the indulgence of appetites at whatever cost to others, the pride of possession and push for domination which is "hard by hate" and oppression—these flourish for a time, but they are self-destructive and are doomed. "Fresher life" humanity "derives from their decay" because "the Waster builds again."

PROPERTY AND THE AWAKENED SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

No giving is too great; no sacrifice is too costly to establish God's righteous rule over everything that destroys the souls of men and breaks down the supports of society. The question is not how much shall we give of money and service, but how much have we a right to keep and how shall the possession we hold in trust be administered to conserve and spread this blessed rule. H. G. Wells, a free lance in religion, says: "The servant of God has no business with wealth or position, except to use them immediately in the service of God. Finding these things

in his hands, he is bound to administer them in the service of God."

This is what the awakened social conscience expects of God's servants. Social radicals risk and give everything to stir up social revolt. God's servants should be as self-sacrificing and as adventurous in promoting spiritual and social regeneration. Billions of bonds have been purchased, excess profits have been given up, the savings of the poorer classes have been contributed in all the allied nations to enable them to overthrow a malevolent autocracy. Why not put such bonds and such profits and such savings at the service of a far more imperative and sublime cause, the enthronement of God's kingdom over the principalities and powers of evil?

The Peace Conference at best will be partial and ineffectual in some of its provisions. It will fail unless the signatories and peoples keep their covenants with God, the Supreme Owner and Sovereign, and renounce their idolatries of Mammon, Militarism, and Materialism. George MacDonald's most earnest exhortation should

be taken to heart: "Cast your idol into the furnace; melt your mammon down; coin him up; make God's money of him and send him coursing. Make of him cups to carry the gift of God, the water of life, through the world. . . . What true gifts might not the mammon of unrighteousness, changed back into the money of God, give to men and women, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh! How would you not spend your money for the Lord if he needed it at your hands? He does need it; for he that spends it upon the least of his fellows spends it upon his Lord. To hold fast upon God with one hand and open wide the other to your neighbor—this is religion; this is the Law and Prophets and the true way to all better things that are yet to come."

INDEX

- America, 36, 65
- Anarchy, 7-16
- Bakounine, 7-13, 20
- Bolshevism, Pre-, 7
- Bolshevism and the Bolsheviki, 23, 32, 35, 38, 39, 40, 46, 51, 52
- Burke, Edmund, 63
- Capitalism, 80-92
- Church, 71, 72, 73
- Clemenceau, 104
- Conference Peace, 35
- Czecho-Slovaks, 68-70
- David, prayer of, 108
- Democracy, 93
- Democracy, Industrial, 98
- Doctrine, Monroe, 37
- Dupries, Charles, 10
- Emerson, 34
- England, 68
- Forces Psychic, 87, 91, 103
- Fox, Charles James, 28
- Froude, 19
- Germany, 69
- Gompers, Samuel, 25
- Hansen, Ole, 47, 111
- Hegel, 8
- Hügel, Von, 17
- Hillquit, Morris, 24
- Hobson, John Atkinson, 90
- Individualism, 17
- International Harvester Co., 97
- I. W. W., 40, 42, 46, 57
- Jaurés, 55
- Jesus and the Social Order, 110, 111
- Jesus and Private Property, 114
- Kautsky, 54
- Kidd, Benjamin, 76, 78
- Labor, 41
- Law, 61, 62
- Lawlessness, 58
- Lawrence, 10
- Lenin, 27, 30, 31, 32
- Liberty, 63
- Lincoln, Abraham, 56, 62
- Lubin, David, 74
- Luxury, 116, 117, 118
- Lynching, 58
- Macdonald, George, 121
- Machiavellianism, 8
- Marshall, Alfred, 81, 82, 83, 85
- Marx, Karl, 20, 44
- Mulford, 107
- Nations, League of, 35, 65, 66
- Nihilism, 12
- Parker, Edwin B., 88
- Poland, 68
- Power, Balance of, 10
- Production, Industrial, 100
- Proletariat, dictatorship of, 30

- Property, private, 106, 114,
120
Proudhon, 15
Revolution, French, 29
Russian, 29
Righteousness, 74, 113
Russia, 49, 50
Russia, Peasants of, 70
Schmoller, 80
Shakespeare, 18, 53
Slavs, 66, 67, 68
Socialism, 96
Sorel, Georges, 43
State, the, 17, 18
Standard Oil Company, 98
Steinmetz, Charles P., 95, 96
Strike, the Universal, 54
Stoddart, Jane T, 44
Struggle, the class, 101
Syndicalism, 42, 45, 53
Thackeray, 9
Times, London, 84
Treitschke, 80
Vienna, Congress of, 64
Wealth, Predatory, 118
Wells, H. G., 74, 120



